Mr. T. G. Nagappa. -When there is loss to raiyats, a suit must be allowed.

Mr. Narasimhaiya and Mr. Krishna Sastri.—He means suits against Government.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—There is no objection to bring a suit against a Government officer. There is only one exemption which applies to judicial officers.

Mr. T. G. Nagappa.—I mean Revenue officers.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—What rules? If the rules complained against are specified we can reply.

Second Member of Council.—People have got the power to bring a suit against a Government official. There is no rule which prohibits them from doing this.

SUBJECT No. 37.

Permission to bring suits against Government in Civil Courts.

(*a*) Mr. H. Maralusiddappa, Arsikere Taluk, and (*b*) Mr. K. T. Seshaiya, Belur Taluk.

Summary of Representation.—(*a*) It is prayed that permission may be granted for bringing suits against Government in Civil Courts. If this is not feasible, a Board of Arbitration may be constituted.

(*b*) The promised grant of the right of suing the Government on the lines of the principles accepted in British India should, it is requested, be expedited in Mysore.

Dewan.—A Bill is under consideration. It will be placed before the Legislative Council at an early date.

SUBJECT No. 38.

Issue of notices to parties in Civil cases which are remanded for further evidence.

Mr. A. Naranaiengar, Hassan Taluk.

Mr. A. Naranaiengar.—In civil cases remanded by the appellate courts for further evidence, notices will not be given to the parties or their pleaders in the lower Courts; and this causes great difficulty to the parties, as they cannot know the exact date of hearing. Definite information cannot be easily had in the Court as notices put on the board will have disappeared or torn, many a time. Parties do not attend the appellate courts and the lawyers become indifferent. It is therefore very necessary that notices may be given to parties mentioning the date of hearing by the lower courts, as soon as records are received from appellate courts

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—The present order was passed, because there was a complaint of delay.

Mr. Naranaiengar.—Often records are not received, and no information is available.

Second Member of Council.—Lawyers will be present and they will have notice.

Mr. Naranaiengar.—It is better to give the notice to the party himself.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—Are there instances of any grievance occasioned by this rule?

Mr. Belur Srinivasiengar and Mr. Naraniengar.—There are a number of instances. At least a notice through post is necessary.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—This is not being done now, with a view to avoid delay. The matter will be enquired into again.

Dewan.—Will be considered again.

SUBJECT No. 39.

Preparation of copies on both sides of copying sheets.

Mr. K. N. Srikantaiya, Alur Sub-Taluk.

Messrs. Purushottamanandagiri Goswami and Karnick Krishnamurti Rao.—Some of the copyists do not write the prescribed number of words on each page and this will unnecessarily add to the cost of the parties. If

a rule is laid down that both sides of the copying sheet should be used, the difficulty will be obviated.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—How much is the copyist to be paid?

Mr. Purushottamanandagiri Goswami.—Each page contains only 75 words.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—There is an order to write 100 words.

Mr. Purushottamanandagiri Goswami.—It is not followed.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—Bring a case to the notice of the Judge.

Mr. Purushottamanandagiri Goswami.—It is so in every case. A circular may issue.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—There is already an order in the matter. If specific cases in which the order is not adhered to is brought to the notice of the judges or munsiffs, they will set matters right. If cases are brought to our notice, we will issue another circular.

SUBJECT No. 40.

Notifying the date of delivery of immoveable properties in Civil Courts.

Mr. K. N. Srikantaiya, Alur Sub-Taluk.

Mr. K. N. Srikantaiya.—The exact date of delivery of immoveable property to a decree-holder will not be notified by the Civil Courts, and the party cannot know on what date the Amin visits his village for the purpose of giving delivery of the property. If the date of delivery is notified, there will not be any such difficulty, as the party can make it convenient to be present for taking delivery of the property.

Mr. Shamaiengar.—It is necessary that the parties should know the exact dates of visit of the Amin to their place.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—Parties usually take the Amin themselves

Messrs. Srikantaiya & Shamaiengar.—That is exactly what we want to avoid.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—The order of the court will be to the effect that delivery should be given within a certain date. If the party is not present on any particular date to take delivery, there will be an adjournment, and he can take delivery on some other day the Amin visits his place.

Dewan.—We will refer the matter to the Chief Court and see what can be done.

SUBJECT No. 41.

Enhancing the rate of interest on decrees passed by Civil Courts.

Mr. A. Narasimha Iyengar, Sagar Taluk.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa—This is very necessary.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—There is no restriction. A low interest is good. Otherwise the decree-holder will not execute and that too deliberately.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—Even on representation, a high rate is not given.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—You can appeal in such cases.

Mr. Purushottamanandagiri Goswami.—Interest may be allowed on decrees passed by civil courts, according to the